



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/055,594	01/22/2002	Roland E. Williams	ZICO0035	6960
22862 7590 07/30/2010 GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025				
EXAMINER VO, HUYEN X				
ART UNIT 2626		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 07/30/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

eptomatters@glenn-law.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/055,594

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS, ROLAND E.

Examiner

HUYEN X. VO

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/22/2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Previous office action has been withdrawn in favor of the current non-final office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0128832) in view of Crupi et al. (USPN 6195636).
4. Regarding claim 1, Smith discloses a language processing and memory module (i) which is physically, attachable to and detachable from an appliance (*figures 3A-C; language module is physically attachable and detachable from the computing device*), (ii) which is configured to communicate directly with the appliance when so attached without the use of a network which extends outside the appliance (*figures 3A-C, no external network is required*), and (iii) which is configured to perform language-specific tasks (*figure 3A-C; module 45 performing speech recognition for the computing device or referring to paragraph 39*) by: receiving an instruction for language-specific processing (*paragraph 39*); and sending resulting data of the language-specific processing to the appliance (*paragraph 39*).

Smith fails to specifically disclose that the instruction or request for language-specific processing received at the language module is from the appliance. However, Crupi et al. teach a telephone system having distributed speech recognition capability for voice dialing application in that the cellular telephone receives a voice command from the user and transmits it to the server for recognition and execution of the voice command (abstract section).

Since Smith and Crupi et al. are analogous in the art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Smith by incorporating the teaching of Crupi et al. in order to enable commands received at the telephone device with limited processing power to be interpreted for the device.

5. Claims 1, 3-6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coon et al. (USPN 6539358) in view of Crupi et al. (USPN 6195636).
6. Regarding claim 1, Coon et al. disclose a language processing and memory module (i) which is physically, attachable to and detachable from an appliance (*figures 1-2; computing device is physically attachable and detachable from the docking station*), (ii) which is configured to communicate directly with the appliance when so attached without the use of a network which extends outside the appliance (*figures 1-2, no external network is required*), and (iii) which is configured to perform language-specific tasks (*figure 2; docking station performing speech recognition for the computing device*;

also referring to col. 3, lines 41-67) by: receiving an instruction for language-specific processing (speech recognizer 36 in figure 2 processed the input speech); and sending resulting data of the language-specific processing to the appliance (col. 3, lines 41-67; recognition result is sent back to the computing device or telephone system to dial the recognized telephone numbers).

Coon et al. fail to specifically disclose that the instruction or request for language-specific processing received at the language module is from the appliance. However, Crupi et al. teach a telephone system having distributed speech recognition capability for voice dialing application in that the cellular telephone receives a voice command from the user and transmits it to the server for recognition and execution of the voice command (abstract section).

Since Coon et al. and Crupi et al. are analogous in the art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Coon et al. by incorporating the teaching of Crupi et al. in order to enable commands received at the telephone device with limited processing power to be interpreted for the device.

7. Regarding claims 3-6 and 10, Coon et al. further disclose the language module of claim 1 wherein the language module is configured to perform language-specific tasks according to a subject language at the request of the appliance by also receiving data representing a user input gesture (*speech input 34 in figure 2*); and sending data representing one or more language units of the subject language in accordance with the

user input gesture (*figure 2*), wherein the language units are characters (*output of speech recognizer 36 in figure 2*), wherein the language units are words (*output of speech recognizer 36 in figure 2*), wherein the language units are phrases (*output of speech recognizer 36 in figure 2*), wherein the language module is configured to perform language-specific tasks according to the subject language at the request of the appliance by also sending data representing one or more language unit components which are of the subject language and which correspond to the user input gesture (*output of the speech recognizer 36 in figure 2*).

8. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coon et al. (USPN 6539358) in view of Crupi et al. (USPN 6195636), and further in view of Ito (USPN 6243675).

9. Regarding claims 2, Coon et al. further disclose the language module of claim 1 wherein the language module is configured to perform language-specific tasks according to a subject language at the requests of the appliance by also: receiving data representing a character in the subject language (*speech input in figure 2 is data representing a character of the subject language*). Coon et al. fail to specifically disclose sending data specifying a graphical representation of the character to the appliance. However, Ito teaches sending data specifying a graphical representation of the character to the appliance (*inherently included in the system of Ito since Japanese, English, German use different character fonts*).

Since the modified of Coon et al. and Ito are analogous in the art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Coon et al. by incorporating the teaching of Ito in order to process and present different languages for different users.

10. Regarding claim 7, the modified Coon et al. fail to specifically disclose the language module of claim 7, wherein selecting the one or more language units according to one or more preceding language units which were previously specified by the user. However, Ito further teaches herein selecting the one or more language units according to one or more preceding language units which were previously specified by the user (*figure 2, system identify the language intended by the user and select the language*).

Since the modified of Coon et al. and Ito are analogous in the art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Coon et al. by incorporating the teaching of Ito in order to process different language for different users.

11. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coon et al. (US 6539358), in view of Crupi et al. (USPN 6195636), further in view of Ito (US 6243675), and further in view of Bellegarda et al. (US 6208971).

12. Regarding claims 8-9, the modified Coon et al. fail to specifically disclose the language processing and memory module of claim 7 wherein selecting comprises: determining word-continuation and name-continuation relationships between the preceding language units and the one or more language units. However, Bellegarda et al. further teach determining word-continuation and name-continuation relationships between the preceding language units and the one or more language units (*col. 3, lines 1-11, further details referring to col. 4, line 39 to col. 5, line 67, current word depends on previous words*).

Since the modified Coon et al. and Bellegarda et al. are analogous in the art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Coon et al. by incorporating the teaching of Bellegarda et al. in order to improve speech command recognition accuracy.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUYEN X. VO whose telephone number is (571)272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Huyen X Vo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

7/27/2010
